

REMARKS

At the outset, the Applicant wishes to thank Patent Examiner Thao Tran for the many courtesies extended to the undersigned attorney on March 7, 2007, during the Personal Interview at the U.S.P.T.O. The substance of this Personal Interview is set forth in the Examiner Interview Summary, and in this Amendment.

During the Personal Interview, the Patent Examiner did not indicate that claim 1, as now being amended, appears to overcome the prior art of record. The Patent Examiner had essentially required three additions to claim 1 as follows:

(I) That the Preamble of claim 1 further recite "for roofing membranes" (based on claim 29);

(II) That a second barrier layer made of lacquer be claimed and located between the first film layer and the second film layer; (based on claim 16); and

(III) That one side of the first film layer be coated with a silicone layer (based on claim 11).

During the Personal Interview, the Patent Examiner also suggested that claim 1 be amended to cancel the language "configured to provide," because this language is vague and

indefinite. The Patent Examiner is also requiring that broad claim 25 and its dependent claims be cancelled.

The Patent Examiner has also stated that a Terminal Disclaimer should be filed in order to overcome the obviousness-type double-patenting rejection, such that all of the outstanding rejections can be overcome with the filing of the present Amendment. Thus a Terminal Disclaimer is being filed.

Therefore, claim 1 is being amended as discussed above and claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 21, 25, and 26 are being cancelled.

Also, claims 22, 23, or 24, are each being rewritten in independent claim format.

During the Personal Interview with the Patent Examiner, it was pointed out that a minor typographical error occurred in the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of the U.S. Specification. Thus, this paragraph is being amended to indicate that the layer with the positioning of the larger coefficient of expansion will guarantee "preventing" detachment of the film combination from the substrate being covered. The Patent Examiner agreed that this omission of the word "preventing" was just a minor typographical omission, which can be corrected.

On Page 4 of the office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 8-9, 11-13, 15, and 17-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Wiercinski et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,687,517).

On Page 5 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 8-9, 11-13, 15, and 17-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hamdar et al* (U.S. 2003/0215594).

On Page 6 of the Office Action, the Patent Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiercinski* or *Hamdar* as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of *Bochow* (U.S. Patent No. 5,449,552).

All of these rejections are respectfully traversed, as having been rendered moot, because of all of the above-mentioned amendments to the claims. Specifically, no combination of prior art references teaches a multilayer film having two barrier layers and a silicon layer, plus all of the other claimed layers.

All of the above-noted amendments to the claims are also supported in the present Specification on pages 4, 8, and 9.

For all the reasons set forth above, none of the prior art references provides an identical disclosure of the claimed invention. Hence, the present invention is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. 102, but is patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over all the prior art applied by the Patent Examiner. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

Because two (2) extra independent claims have been added, enclosed herewith is a check in the amount of 2 X (\$200.00) or \$400.00 to pay for the additionally added claims. The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee, or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03-2468.

A prompt notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael FÜRST

Edward Freedman

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Allison C. Collard; Reg. No. 22,532
Edward R. Freedman, Reg. No. 26,048
William C. Collard, Reg. No. 38,411
Attorneys for Applicants

Enclosures: 1. Copy of Petition for 3 Month Extension of Time
 2. Terminal Disclaimer

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP: Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, U.S. PTO, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 14, 2007.

Kelly Espitia
Kelly Espitia